

31 JUL 1980

MEMORANDUM FOR: Special Assistant to the Deputy Director
of Central Intelligence

FROM: Harry E. Fitzwater
Director of Personnel Policy, Planning,
and Management

SUBJECT: Comments on Midcareerist Proposal to Peer
and Subordinate Ratings in Selecting SIS
Award Recipients

STAT

STAT
STAT

1. The SIS Support Staff studied [redacted] paper and sent it to the SIS interdirectorate working group for review and comment (without attribution to [redacted]). The staff met with [redacted] on 21 July and discussed the concept in detail.

2. The positive aspects of the concept include:

a. It emphasizes interpersonal relations and esprit de corps, which certainly are vital ingredients to a good organization.

b. It undoubtedly would keep supervisors on their toes in relationships with peers and subordinates.

c. It would give employees at all levels a sense of involvement in rewarding managers.

3. The negative aspects of the concept include:

a. It is based solely on interpersonal relations. Other equally vital factors such as mission accomplishment and production are not considered.

b. It could undermine rather than strengthen supervisor-subordinate relationships, and lead to supervisors unduly interested in pleasing their subordinates. This objection has been raised in universities where students have been allowed to rate professors.

c. The multiple rating system would create a geometric increase in paperwork.

4. Apart from the above views, there is serious doubt that making performance awards under such a system would be consistent with existing Civil Service Reform Act (CSRA) and Office of Personnel Management guidelines. As you know, the CSRA specifically states that performance evaluation is the key factor in selecting Senior Executive Service recipients of performance awards and rank stipends. This evaluation is based on individual accomplishment in attaining organization goals. It would thus seem inappropriate to base awards solely on how successful an individual is in interpersonal relationships.

STAT

5. [] noted that he prepared the paper at your request after he had mentioned the concept in an informal session in the Midcareer Course. We believe he did a good job of presenting the concept, which he did not intend to present as a complete staff proposal.

STAT

6. We believe the idea of peer or subordinate evaluation is worthy of further consideration as a training tool if not as a formal rating system. We propose to make it available to the Office of Training and to our Plans and Evaluation Staff. We would also advise [] of this action and thank him for an imaginative and thought-provoking paper.

Signed
Harry E. Fitzwater

Distribution:

Orig - Addce

1 - ER

2 - D/PPPM

✓ 2 - C/SIS/SS

STAT

OPPPM/C/SIS/SS, [] :pmk(30Ju180)

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

FROM:

D/PPPM
5E58, Hqtrs.

EXTENSION

NO.

DATE

31 JUL 1980

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S
INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. DDCI
7E12, Hqtrs.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

We have no problem. Assume the DCI meant both Distinguished and Meritorious stipend recipients even though his numbers are off (3-4 versus as many as 28).

Harry E. Fitzwater

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

FROM:

D/PPPM
5E58, Hqtrs.

EXTENSION

NO.

ER-80-1090/1

DATE

15 JUL 1980

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. DDCI
7E12, Hqtrs.

7/17/80

JK

coordinated by
Execum staff
on

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10. D/PPPM 22 JUL 1980
5E58, Hqtrs.

22 JUL 1980

HEF

11. Chief, SIS/SS 22 JUL 1980

12.

13.

14.

15.

Only not pick
is I would
think publishing
shaped awards
would be good -
if only 3-4 for
whole Agency
there's no stigma
to not receiving
one

SP